

**PARVIZ FIRUDINOQLU KAZIMI**

Baku State University (Bakı şəh, Z.Xəlilov, 23)  
Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy,

ORCID: - Parviz Kazimi4[0000-0001-5577-4773]

**MEHMANALI MAMMADOV**

Baku State University  
Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy,

**ORCID: 0000-0002-0195-2375**

**ZAHIDA TOFIQ RZAYEVA**

Baku State University,  
Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy

ORCID:-/0000-0003-3696-6950

## **METHODOLOGY OF DIVISION OF MODERN LIBRARIES INTO TYPES AND KINDS**

**(modern challenges and scientific-theoretical analysis)**

### **Abstrast:**

One of the tasks awaiting solution in modern world library science is scientific and theoretical substantiation of the problem of division of libraries into types. It is known that today there is no scientifically substantiated classification of libraries by types, and the main characteristics that form a type are not clearly defined by specialists. Therefore, various opinions of specialists on this problem are constantly reflected in periodicals on this topic and discussions are held.

The problem of types and typology of libraries in the theory of library science was actively studied by Russian-Soviet specialists. In the globalizing world, libraries also change their nature and expand the range of their services. It is necessary to express the modern scientific and theoretical essence of changing libraries.

The article analyzes scientific works devoted to this problem, as well as the patterns of creation of libraries. Thus, the problem of library typology is of interest not only to specialists, but also to the broad library community. The article describes in detail the essence and criteria for dividing libraries into types, shows the features that until recently underlay the division of libraries into types, as well as its negative and positive sides.

**Key words:** *classification of libraries, functions of libraries, responsibilities of a librarian, theory of library science, typology of libraries, types of libraries.*

**Introduction:**

Classification or division of libraries into types has great theoretical and practical significance, as it allows us to determine the profile and features of various libraries, their readership, and their place in the system of library institutions in the country. Until recently, in the existing theoretical literature and other related scientific literature, classification and typification were often used as synonyms, and no strict boundary was established between them. The problem of dividing libraries into types and varieties has always been in the spotlight as a fundamental theoretical problem of library science. It can be said that another problem has been added to this one. These are the opposing opinions of individual researchers and specialists on the issue of the presence or absence of a difference between the concept of library classification and their division into types and kinds. This topic has recently become the subject of discussion in specialized journals of librarians of Russia with great scientific potential and traditions (Library Science, Scientific and Technical Libraries, Libraries of Eurasia, Business Bibliotechnics, Bibliopanorama, etc.). Thus, the outstanding librarian prof. N.S. Kartashov, in his article "The Essence and Criterion of Library Typology," published in 1996, considered it appropriate to use the concepts of classification and type as synonyms<sup>1</sup>. However, in the same year, another Russian librarian, Professor Yu. N. Stalyarov, tried to prove that the concepts of classification and type are not strictly synonymous and that they are different concepts.<sup>2</sup> Such discussions show that the classification and typology of libraries still remain an unresolved and pressing problem.

**THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE TOPIC:**

Without a certain methodology, it is impossible to accurately determine the diversity of libraries. This is due to the fact that classification theory as a general science is still developing, and many of its concepts have not yet been established. For example. The term "typology" has not yet received an unambiguous definition; in one case, it is considered a special section of classification, in another - as its complete opposite. It should be noted that there is no unambiguous solution to this problem in reference books and dictionaries yet.

Most library researchers do not distinguish between the concepts of "classification" and "typology". This is evidenced by the publication of the "Terminological Dictionary of Librarianship and Related Branches of Knowledge", which is considered one of the latest terminological dictionaries in librarianship. Here, typology is defined as the term "scientific classification of libraries by common basic characteristics".<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Kartashov N.S. The essence and criteria of library typology // Scientific and technical libraries.- 1996.- №3.-с.35-46

<sup>2</sup> Stalyarov Y.N. Generic-specific and typological classification of libraries // Library Vision.- 1996, №5.- с.25-39

<sup>3</sup> Terminological dictionary of librarianship and related fields/BEN RAS.Moskva,1995.360 p.

Typology deals with the grouping of objects. On its basis, a model is created, called a generalized type. The creation of a type is based on common typological features. Typology defines the relationship between library types, the integrity and indivisibility of an object.

Any field of science accumulates scientific knowledge over time, develops and, having reached a certain maturity, begins to classify its object. In this regard, there is no generally accepted classification of librarianship in library science yet. However, in practice, typology is widespread, and in many cases it is sufficient and necessary for grouping objects.

Considering that the modern scientific explanation of the concepts of classification and type is not entirely accurate, it does not seem appropriate to present the opinions of many researchers on this matter. Therefore, it can be considered appropriate to use the concepts of "classification" and "type", which were used in existing textbooks, terminological dictionaries of librarianship, program and scientific-methodical literature when classifying libraries into groups according to various features, as synonyms. The reason for this is that the difference between them has not been clearly scientifically defined and, as experts note, has not been resolved to this day.

It is known that the division of libraries into types and varieties allows us to highlight their mission, functions, relationships and other aspects. Depending on this, the composition and structure of library collections should be purposefully formed, reader requests should be met, library work should be effectively managed, etc.

It is known from theoretical literature that two interrelated methods are often used in librarianship. This also includes the concepts of classification and typology. The boundary (difference) between classification and topology is often applied depending on the historical tradition. However, classification involves grouping the quantitative characteristics of the object being studied, while typology involves grouping the object according to its qualitative characteristics. The purpose of classification is to determine the identity of individual objects and their various characteristics or mutual relationships of a set of characteristics.<sup>4</sup> This feature (or set of features) is called the basis of classification. Typology is a synthesis of this general and particular, similarity and diversity. Typology expresses a generalization of the libraries being studied, dividing them into groups and thereby facilitating their understanding.

This is a special division that divides libraries into separate groups. The division is aimed at improving the process, and its result is typology. The need for improvement is felt when organizing the correspondence of a large number of libraries that are not similar to each other, or when studying any patterns during the analysis of such a set. In the typological process, based on the content

---

<sup>4</sup> Kazimi, P. F. O. (2021, September). Global Information Network and Conflicts of Interest (Parties, Interests and Conflicts). In *2021 IEEE 16th International Conference on Computer Sciences and Information Technologies (CSIT)* (Vol. 2, pp. 453-456). IEEE.

analysis of the libraries under study, their similarities and differences are determined, reliable features that create identity are selected.

Library typology takes the concepts of "type" and "kind" as the main qualitative unit that corresponds to different groups of libraries with certain characteristics. In this case, the grouping of libraries by leading typological features is called a type, and with subsequent detailing - a type. In the typological process, two problems are solved simultaneously: theoretical and practical understanding.<sup>5</sup> The problem of theoretical comprehension includes the collection and analysis of facts characterizing the activities of libraries in order to identify objective patterns of their typological development.

Ensures the targeted formation of the composition and structure of the library, satisfaction and activity of readers' requests, their interaction, effective management of libraries, etc. taking into account the type and kind of libraries, their general and specific features. The typology of libraries in the theory of library science in countries of the world has not yet received full scientific development. Librarians often face this problem both in Europe and in the countries of the former Soviet Union. Their classification is often inconsistent and creates terminological confusion. However, many scientists, as in the USA, distinguish the following types of libraries: national, educational, academic and special.<sup>6</sup> For example, UNESCO offers the following division:

- National libraries;
- Libraries of higher education institutions;
- Large public universal libraries;
- Educational libraries;
- Special libraries (libraries of research institutes, public organizations, departments, museums, etc.);
- Mass public (or community) libraries.

As you can see, the existing diversity of libraries is noted here, but there is no place for scientific typology. The initiative of Russian librarians in this direction is interesting. It is known that the typology of libraries reflects the process of development of librarianship, the emergence and growth

---

<sup>5</sup> Kazimi, P. F., & Gurbanov, A. I. (2022). Today's factors of user satisfaction with library services and their quality. *Scientific and Technical Libraries*, (2), 109-122.

<sup>6</sup> Libraries and Librarianship in the United States: An Integrated Approach. M.,1999.-296 c.

of new libraries, the complexity of their functions. As early as the 1920s, many former Soviet librarians distinguished three types of libraries: public, scientific and school.<sup>7</sup>

In 1930, the Russian librarian M.K. Patapov spoke out against the division of libraries into public and scientific. He believed that such a division contrasts academic libraries with public libraries. This gives reason to believe that the former is intended only for scientists, and the latter - for the masses. Therefore, Patapov, based on the collection of libraries, divided them into two types: universal and special libraries.

In the 1940s, the prominent librarian M.I. Frumin, based on the nature of reader surveys, considered it appropriate to return to the mass-scientific division of libraries.

In the 1950s and 1960s, a group of "Russian librarians" distinguished libraries by their readership, dividing them into two main types: mass, scientific and special. Understanding that the listed characteristics are a minority for the areas of library activity, they proposed adding other characteristics (characteristics reflecting the territorial and administrative affiliation of libraries).

In the 1970s and 1990s, a special discussion was held in the journal "Scientific and Technical Libraries of the USSR" devoted to the problem of library typology. During the discussion, various typological concepts were put forward. The group of authors divided libraries into public and scientific, universal and special, general and administrative, scientific and children's. A common shortcoming of the typological concepts put forward was the lack of a single logical basis for classification created for all the different types of libraries. Thus, the researchers were unable to reach a consensus on which characteristics of libraries are primary and which are secondary.

In recent years, an original approach to the typology of libraries has been of interest, developed by an employee of the Russian State Library M.I. Akilina and associate professor of the Kyiv Institute of Culture E.T. Solivertsova. According to the concept of M.I. Akilina<sup>8</sup>, it is impossible to create a single hierarchical classification of libraries by their areas of activity. She classifies libraries by documentary, demand and information activities. Akilina tries to prove that each library simultaneously belongs to typological groups depending on the specified areas of activity. This approach allows the author to typify libraries, dividing them by individual features, as a result of which, instead of a hierarchical classification, an ordinary typological series is formed, each of which corresponds to certain features. E.T. Selivertsova divides them into sectoral, intersectoral and

---

<sup>7</sup> Mammadov, M., Zeynalova, H., & Manafgyzi, E. R. (2024). Müasir Kitabxana-Informasiya Fəaliyyətinin İnformasiya Modeli. Akademik Tarih Ve Düşünce Dergisi, 11(5), 3644-3651. <https://doi.org/10.46868/atdd.2024.834>

<sup>8</sup> Akilina M.I. Classification and typology of libraries. Methodological issues // Library science. - 1996, №3.- c. 38-46.

universal types depending on the composition of library collections<sup>9</sup>. In 1994, employees of the Russian State Library A.V. Grishin and A.M. Ushakova proposed taking the reasons for visiting the library by readers as the basis for classification. In their opinion, this reveals the main direction of information demand. Accordingly, they divide libraries into two main classes: general and special. Later, they were divided into subclasses based on the characteristics of reader surveys.

The first group of libraries is focused on satisfying "high-level requests", while the second group includes libraries that respond to standardized requests. The same approach was applied to the division of special libraries. High-level reader surveys are academic libraries; Standardized production requests are studied by production libraries, and educational requests are studied by educational libraries.

In our opinion, the emergence of library types does not occur logically, but gradually and "contextually". Of the many features that allow us to reflect the essence of libraries as social institutions that are not equal in their importance, it is important to highlight the first. The public, social purpose of libraries meets such requirements to a greater extent. These are the features that determine the importance of the functional approach to the classification of libraries, allow us to identify stable substantive characteristics of libraries and, above all, differentiate them by their nature, content and area of activity, which in turn is determined by the nature of satisfying information needs. Their uniqueness stems from the process of differentiation and integration, covering the entire sphere of public life.

The integration of complex and specialized topics into the information needs of modern professionals naturally links library typology with integration and differentiation. This also corresponds to two types of libraries: universal and specialized. We can also agree with the idea of singling out national libraries as a third type, put forward by librarians in recent years. This is due to the fact that national libraries have a special social significance in the library and information system of the country and have already found their place in practice.

The next type of division is considered the same for all types of libraries. It defines the main functional purpose of libraries and is determined by three groups of facts: formal, substantive and systematic. Formal features depend on specific operating conditions, and when opening a library, a very precise scope of its functions is determined, which is determined by its activities within a specific department, organization, territory. Libraries can be organized by any state bodies, local government bodies, public associations, legal entities and individuals. For example, in accordance with the rules of management and forms of ownership of the Russian Federation, the Federal Law on Librarianship divides libraries into the following main types: state libraries (federal, regional, ministerial and departmental); municipal libraries (city, district, rural); libraries of scientific,

---

<sup>9</sup> Selivertsova E.A. Functional nature of needs as a basis for the typology of libraries // Scientific and technical libraries, 1999.- №4.-c.6-12

educational and specialized educational institutions, libraries of enterprises, organizations, administrations, libraries of public associations, private libraries.<sup>10</sup>

It follows that in the federal law, libraries are differentiated by the principle of affiliation without any scientific basis. However, this in itself is not entirely consistent. Thus, state libraries, unlike the libraries of federal ministries, belong to the federal state. That is, by status it is a state library, but it is subordinate to the Ministry of Culture. This rule applies throughout the territory of the former Soviet Union, including the Republic of Azerbaijan.

This is explained by the fact that post-Soviet countries are "tied" to the use of Russian experience.

It should be noted that, in contrast to various ideas and concepts that have existed in the theory and practice of library science to date, a prominent librarian, professor of the Baku State University A.A. Khalafov<sup>11</sup> put forward the principle of historicity as one of the main principles of dividing libraries into types. A. Khalafov writes in the textbook "Introduction to Library Science": "... one of the main principles of librarianship is the principle of historicity"<sup>12</sup>. It is within the framework of the principle of historicity when examining the history of world libraries that it is necessary to study the historical necessity that led to the emergence of a particular type and kind of library, and under what circumstances.

From the history of libraries in the Ancient World, it is known that even before the new era, there were three types of libraries in the world: libraries of heads of state; public libraries; personal libraries of outstanding scientists, poets, intellectuals and statesmen.

As examples of state libraries, we can cite the Nineveh Library, where the clay tablets of the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal, considered a giant of science and culture in the ancient world, were kept, the Alexandria Library, where books on papyrus were kept, and the Pergamon Library, where leather, i.e. parchment, books were kept. In subsequent years, in connection with the emergence of kingdoms and principalities, royal and palace libraries began to appear. From European countries: Germany, England, Italy, Spain, France, etc. Just as royal libraries were created, palace libraries were created in eastern states such as Iran, Turkey, Azerbaijan and a number of Arab countries.<sup>13</sup> In Azerbaijan, one can note the Palace of the Shirvanshahs, founded in the 12th century, the Sheikh

---

<sup>10</sup> About librarianship: federal law of the Russian Federation. November 23, 1994 // Scientific and technical libraries. 1995, №6.- c. 3-21

<sup>11</sup> Qurbanov, A. İ., & Kazimi, P. F. (2013). Azərbaycan'da Kütüphanecilik Eğitimi: Kısa Bir Tarihçe. *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, 27(4), 648-650.

<sup>12</sup> Kazimi, P. F. O., & Guliyeva, N. A. G. (2023). " Time" spent in youth's "global information space"(problems of satisfaction of reading or information need). *Procedia Computer Science*, 219, 720-723.

<sup>13</sup> Kazimi, P. F. (2017). Role of Books and Libraries in Creating Social and Cultural Environment. *Turkish Librarianship*, 31(2), 245-250.

Safi library founded by Shah Ismail Khatai, as well as the libraries of the Safavid shahs. Religious libraries gradually began to emerge in connection with the emergence and development of religion. In the ancient world and especially in the Middle Ages, the emergence of secular schools along with religious schools in developed countries of the world and the growth of such networks led to the need for a new type of library - school libraries. In a short period of time, this type of store became the most widely ramified network in the world. Later, the emergence of colleges, universities and research institutes led to the creation of university libraries and special scientific libraries, which have the largest networks in the world (8,28).<sup>14</sup>

If we base the division of libraries into "types" by Professor A. Khalafov on the principle of historicity, it is clear that the main type is the type of public and private libraries. It is very interesting that Professor of the Moscow State University of Culture Yu. N. Stolyarov also put forward the principle of division in accordance with this idea.<sup>15</sup> In his opinion, since libraries have many areas of activity, it is impossible to classify them specifically by one feature. In this case, it is appropriate to classify libraries by the origin of their creation, that is, by the principle of who created them. The author rightly notes that, in general, no one can deny that libraries are organized by society or an individual. Therefore, libraries can be divided into two main origins - public and private libraries. That is, they are classified by who organized them. As can be seen, Professor A. Khalafov also generally takes the historically established division of libraries in this way.

The first paragraph of the first chapter of the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan "On Librarianship", adopted on December 29, 1998, states: "A library is a public institution that collects and stores printed works and other information carriers, organizes their systematic public use, serves the development of the intellectual and spiritual potential of society, as a scientific, information, cultural, educational and upbringing institution."<sup>16</sup> According to this systematization, libraries can be divided into scientific, information, cultural, educational and upbringing, which expresses the modern mission of libraries.<sup>17</sup>

## CONCLUSION

"Library science" is a relatively young branch of science in the system of modern sciences - at present, it is practically experiencing a period of maturity. Like all functional sciences, library science

---

<sup>14</sup> Xələfov A.A. Kitabxanaşünaslığa giriş dərs vəsaiti B., 1996.- 58 s.

<sup>15</sup> Stolyarov Y.N. Generic-specific and typological classification of libraries // Library Vision.- 1996, №5.- c.25-39.

<sup>16</sup> <https://e-qanun.az/framework/5041>

<sup>17</sup> Kazimi, P. F. O., & Mammadov, M. A. O. (2020). ASSESSMENT OF THE LIBRARY INFORMATION SERVICE (MODERN PROBLEMS OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES). *American Scientific Journal*, (41-3), 41-44.

has its own scientific methodology, object and subject, regularities, principles, theory and conceptual apparatus.

One of the problems that has been facing librarianship for many years and is waiting for its solution is the classification of libraries, that is, their grouping and division into types according to various characteristics. It must be admitted that Russian librarians are more concerned with the problem of typification of libraries and are working intensively in this direction. However, studies show that the problem of library classification facing librarianship has not yet been fully resolved. It is noteworthy that not only its classification, but also the concept of systematization and division into types is not unambiguously accepted by various librarians. At the same time, the explanation of this concept also caused a discussion among librarians.<sup>18</sup> Considering that currently in the Republic of Azerbaijan, as in the republics of the former Soviet Union, two main types of libraries have been formed, and the third type is national libraries, their division into universal and special libraries is accepted as the final type. On this basis, the typological features and areas of activity of these libraries are revealed.

## REFERENCE

Kartashov N.S. The essence and criteria of library typology // Scientific and technical libraries.-1996.- №3.-c.35-46

Stalyarov Y.N. Generic-specific and typological classification of libraries // Library Vision.- 1996, №5.- c.25-39.

Terminological dictionary of librarianship and related fields/BEN RAS.Moskva,1995.360 p.

Libraries and Librarianship in the United States: An Integrated Approach. M.,1999.-296 c.

Akilina M.I. Classification and typology of libraries. Methodological issues // Library science. - 1996, №3.- c. 38-46.

Selivertsova E.A. Functional nature of needs as a basis for the typology of libraries // Scientific and technical libraries, 1999.- №4.-c.6-12

About librarianship: federal law of the Russian Federation. November 23, 1994 // Scientific and technical libraries. 1995, №6.- c. 3-21.

Xələfov A.A. Kitabxanaşünaslığa giriş dərs vəsaiti B., 1996.- 58 s.

---

<sup>18</sup> Kazimi, P. F. O. (2021). Democratic countries and ways of influencing the nature of information. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 22, 847.

Mammadov, M., Zeynalova, H., & Manafgyzi, E. R. (2024). Müasir Kitabxana-Informasiya Fəaliyyətinin İnformasiya Modeli. Akademik Tarih Ve Düşünce Dergisi, 11(5), 3644-3651. <https://doi.org/10.46868/atdd.2024.834>

Kazimi, P. F. O., & Mammadov, M. A. O. (2020). ASSESSMENT OF THE LIBRARY INFORMATION SERVICE (MODERN PROBLEMS OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES). *American Scientific Journal*, (41-3), 41-44.

Kazimi, P. F. O. (2021). Democratic countries and ways of influencing the nature of information. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 22, 847.

Kazimi, P. F. O., & Guliyeva, N. A. G. (2023). " Time" spent in youth's "global information space"(problems of satisfaction of reading or information need). *Procedia Computer Science*, 219, 720-723.

Kazimi, P. F. (2017). Role of Books and Libraries in Creating Social and Cultural Environment. *Turkish Librarianship*, 31(2), 245-250.

Kazimi, P. F. O. (2021, September). Global Information Network and Conflicts of Interest (Parties, Interests and Conflicts). In *2021 IEEE 16th International Conference on Computer Sciences and Information Technologies (CSIT)* (Vol. 2, pp. 453-456). IEEE.

Kazimi, P. F., & Gurbanov, A. I. (2022). Today's factors of user satisfaction with library services and their quality. *Scientific and Technical Libraries*, (2), 109-122.